

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/288,943	04	4/09/1999	STEVE INGISTOV	ARCO-25.195	8048		
4249	7590	02/24/2003					
BP AMERI			EXAMINER				
200 E. RANI	OOLPH D		07A	KWON, JOHN			
CHICAGO, I	CHICAGO, IL 60601-7125 ART UNIT PAPER NUM 3747 DATE MAILED: 02/24/2003				PAPER NUMBER		
							
					3		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		09/288,943	INGISTOV, STEVE
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		John T. Kwon	3747
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	ication appears on the cover sheet wi	ith the correspondence address
THE N - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNI nsions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comm period for reply specified above is less than thirty (3 period for reply is specified above, the maximum st. re to reply within the set or extended period for reply eply received by the Office later than three months a department term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ICATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a renunication. io) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of third atutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON will, by statute, cause the application to become AB	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	led on	
2a)□		2b)⊠ This action is non-final.	
3)□	Since this application is in condition	n for allowance except for formal mat tice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.I	
	Claim(s) 32-41 is/are pending in the	e application.	
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/a		
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
	Claim(s) 32-41 is/are rejected.		
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Claim(s) are subject to restric	ction and/or election requirement.	
Applicati	on Papers	·	
9)[The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner.	
10) 🔲 🗆	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the	he Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any obj	ection to the drawing(s) be held in abeya	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11) 🔲 -	The proposed drawing correction file	d on is: a)□ approved b)□ d	isapproved by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are re-	quired in reply to this Office action.	
12) 🗌 -	The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Examiner.	
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim	for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		
	1.	documents have been received.	
	2. Certified copies of the priority	documents have been received in A	pplication No
* S		of the priority documents have been lational Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). In for a list of the certified copies not	•
14) 🗌 A	cknowledgment is made of a claim f	or domestic priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e) (to a provisional application
)		
Attachment	t(s)		
2) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) P	PTO-948) 5) Notice of I	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 3747

DETAILED ACTION

1. The indicated allowability of claims 32-41 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Atkinson (US 5,308,088). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bouchard (US 5,630,590). Bouchard discloses a brush seal (60) mounted on a non-rotating member (22) in a gas turbine engine. The brush seal comprises a ring holder (52), a multiplicity of bristle members (66) extending radially inwardly from the holder, and means for fastening the holder (54). The only difference between the prior art reference and the instant invention is the clearance dimension of the bristle at the ambient temperature. It would have been considered to be an obvious choice of mechanical design because one skilled in this art is familiar with basic fluid

Art Unit: 3747

in the art.

mechanic and normally has the laboratory test facilities. To optimize or select the suitable clearance would be within the ability of ordinary skilled in this art.

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atkinson (US 5,308,088). Atkinson discloses a brush seal (20) mounted on a non-rotating member (12) in a gas turbine engine. The brush seal comprises a ring holder (14), a multiplicity of bristle members (20) extending radially inwardly from the holder, and means for fastening the holder (13).

Moreover, Atkinson discloses a safety margins of the clearance of the brush seal (Col. 2, line 54 - Col. 3, line 9). The difference between the prior art reference and the instant invention is the clearance dimension of the brush seal at the ambient temperature. It would have been considered to be an obvious choice of mechanical design because one skilled in this art is familiar with basic fluid mechanic and normally has the laboratory test facilities. To optimize or select the suitable clearance would be within the ability of ordinary skilled in this art. While Atkinson does not disclose the specific location of the brush seal in the gas turbine engine, the seal can be located at the last stage of the compressor since the installation of the seal in the compressor stage is known

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 135 (b)

5. Claims 32-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 135(b) as not being made prior to one year

from the date on which U.S. Patent No. 5,630,590 was granted.

7/15/97

No Jordan rejector

Art Unit: 3747

The copied claims were submitted on the filing date of the instant application (April 9, 1999) which is not within one year of the issue date of Patent No. 5,630,590 (issue date: May 20, 1997). The proposed interference by the applicant is not granted unless the applicant claimed "substantially the same subject matter" within one year of the issue date of the patent. See MPEP 2307. In order for an application claim to be for "substantially the same subject matter" as a patent claim, it must contain all the material limitations of the patent claim. Parks v. Fine, 773 F.2d 1577, 227 USPQ 432 (Fed. Cir. 1985), modified, 783 F.2d 1036, 228 USPQ 677 (1986). The fact that the application claim may be broad enough to cover the patent claim is not sufficient. In re Frey, 182 F.2d 184, 86 USPQ 99 (CCPA 1950). If none of the claims which were present in the application, or in a parent application, prior to expiration of the one-year period meets the "substantially for the same subject matter" test, the claims presented or identified as corresponding to the proposed count should be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 135(b). In re McGrew, 120 F.3d 1236, 43 USPQ2d 1632 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Accordingly, a brush seal mounted on the refurbished component in tandem with the knife edge seal in a refurbished gas turbine engine component did not claimed within one year. Such claimed limitation appears in the application 09/288 943 filed April 9, 1999, which is more than one year of US Patent No. 5,630,590 was granted.

08/892,738

Art Unit: 3747

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed March 6, 2001 (applicant's appeal brief) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that the limitation of a brush seal mounted on the refurbished component in tandem with the knife edge seal in a refurbished gas turbine engine component supported in the applicants specification. Examiner agreed that such limitations is supported in the specification. However, such limitation has not claimed until the application 09/288,943 was filed on April 9, 1999, which is more than one year after US Patent No. 5,630,590 was granted.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Kwon at telephone number (703) 308-1046 and facsimile numbers (703) 308-7766. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0861.

John T. Kwon Primary Examiner Art Unit 3747

February 4, 2003